

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the claims in the application in view of the remarks below. In the present application, claims 1-15 remain pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the background section of the specification in the present application, referred to by the Examiner as APA, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,867 to Jazdzewski (hereinafter, “Jazdzewski”). The Office Action alleges that APA discloses all elements claimed in independent claims except for “receiving automatically a report of an update ...” According to the Office Action’s allegation, Jazdzewski fills that gap.

While applicants do not agree with the rejections, applicants in this reply are amending independent claims 1, 6, 7, 12 and 15 to further clarify that the first model uses a view of the second model different from a view of the first model and that the first model and the second model are of different applications. Support for the amendment can be found at least on page 7, lines 1-10, page 14, lines 12-14, and pages 34-40 of the originally submitted specification. Claim 11 is being canceled without prejudice.

The cited passages from the background section of the originally submitted specification describe some the known methods for providing a view to an application model. Specifically, paragraph 0026, which the Examiner cites, characterizes known editors that display a source model in a source code view. That paragraph recounts that a user must manually perform an explicit operation in order to see a preview display updated based on an edit. Paragraphs 0005-0008 on page 2 describe an application having interfaces to different views for a model.


Jazdzewski as understood by applicants describes deriving forms from ancestor forms, within the same window or application. While Jazdzewski discloses in the cited columns 9-11 that property changes propagate to descendant forms, Jazdzewski does not disclose or suggest, “receiving automatically a report of an update to the first model and converting the first model edited by said editing module into a second model, said first model using a view of said second model different from a view of said first model, said second model associated with a different application from said application” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 15 and similarly amended in independent claim 7 in the present application.

On the other hand, independent claims 1, 6, 7, 12 and 15 in the present application recite, editing “an application having a model and a view separated from each other” and “said first model using a view of said second model different from a view of said first model.” Further, unlike the forms of Jazdzewski, which are incorporated in the same window all within one visual development application, in the present application, a model uses a view of a different application.

For at least the above-reasons, applicants believe that APA and Jazdzewski do not disclose or suggest the elements of the independent claims as alleged in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Eunhee Park  
Registration No.: 42,976

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, N.Y. 11530  
(516) 742-4343

EP:vh